



Record of Interview

Project Title and Code: SIGAR LL-02: Lessons Learned from Aid Coordination in Afghanistan				
Date: February 19, 2015				
Interviewees: (b)(3), (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)				
SIGAR Attendees: Grant McLeod, Subject Matter Expert / Consultant				
Location: Teleconference				
Purpose: (b)(3), (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)				
Non-attribution Basis:	Yes	X	No	
Recorded:	Yes		No	X
Recording File Record Number:				
Prepared By: Grant McLeod, Subject Matter Expert, Consultant				
Summary of Key Discussion:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (b)(3), (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) 2009 – 2010; PRT changed during that time; Kandahar had 1 US person to oversee their Kandahar program, but went to 40 civilians in PRT and district office; AID had a group of people from outside of the main structure; A lot were young with few years in government; 1 senior service retiree to be the overall head; Focused on district offices as a part of stabilization; • Canadian presence was stable at about 17 people, working at the provincial level; Secretariat for the governor; Structures need to tie in province to the national process; Canada tried to pull down national programs; Implement them at the provincial level; Cooperation with US on specific programs; Not strategically planned, but reasonable synergy with the US; Need both elements; US had decent working relationship; Program Synch Committee; Kandahar and Helmand had some degree of interchange; • Governor had council with ministers that tried to have a role in development, but national programs were pre-determined; PRT was connected to the national level through Canada Mission; Canada has delegated financial authorities; Close relation with the director of health, education, much of way that it rolled out was with their input and guidance; Viewed Ministers and departments as the legitimate guide for the work; Contracted the UN as executors of some funds; Tried to engage at the local level; Were in regular contact; Project Coordination Group; Subject to security; UN agencies had people there; UNDP attended provincial council meetings; • The international community implemented development programs out of existing development pathways; Did not go in with conflict sensitive orientation, no context; Not addressing the real causes of the conflict; No analysis of what was driving the conflict; 				
Follow-up:				
• (b)(3), (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)				